

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-25 are pending in this Application.

In the Office Action, claims 1-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,301,586 (hereinafter “Yang”).

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 102(a)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-25 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) based on Yang.

Applicants respectfully note that to anticipate a pending claim, a prior art reference must provide, either expressly or inherently, each and every limitation of the pending claim. Moreover, the prior art reference must show the identical invention in as complete detail as is contained in the claims with the elements arranged as required by the claims. (M.P.E.P. § 2131).

The Office Action alleges that Yang teaches or suggests all of the claim limitations of claims 1-25. However, based on the arguments presented below, Applicants respectfully submit that Yang fails to teach or suggest one or more of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1-25 in as complete detail as is contained in the claims with the elements arranged as required by the claims.

Applicants note that the format in which the Office Action chooses to present its evidence and reasoning in support of its prima facie case of anticipation is confusing and causes the Office Action to be vague. Yet, in a good faith effort, Applicants attempt to respond by providing a substantive discussion of the differences between specific claim elements and what Applicants understand from the Office Action to be evidence found in the cited references and used to reject the claims.

For example, claim 1 recites in part:

receiving information at a processor of a computer system identifying a selection criterion

On page 3, the Office Action appears to equate Yang’s alleged disclosure of querying a database system “by using predefined criteria” with “identifying a selection criteria.”

Applicants assume that the Office Action is attempting to evidence that Yang teaches or suggests the feature recited in claim 1 of “receiving information...identifying a selection criterion.”

While a user in Yang is able to search a database for information that has been added to albums, what is more ambiguous is that the Office Action fails to point out how Yang allegedly uses predefined criteria identified in the Office Action as arranged in other features of claim 1. Yang merely uses the predefined criteria referenced in the Office Action to query a database system. In Col. 7, lines 19-26, Yang merely suggests that the database is used for “storing all information associated with albums and images.” Yang does not make clear from this passage whether the actual multimedia objects are also stored in the database and thus queried using the alleged “predefined criteria”, but it is clear that the alleged predefined criteria in Yang is merely used to query “information associated with albums and images.”

In another example, claim 1 recites in part:

analyzing with the processor of the computer system **the multimedia information** stored by the plurality of multimedia documents based on the information **to identify portions of video information or audio information in the multimedia information that satisfy the selection criterion**; (emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that Yang does not disclose or suggest a process as recited in claim 1 where multimedia information stored by a plurality of multimedia documents is analyzed to identify portions of video information or audio information in the multimedia information that satisfy a selection criterion. This is because, as discussed above, Yang simply searches a database for “information associated with albums and images” that satisfy user-entered criteria which is a substantially different process from searching or analyzing the multimedia information itself as recited in claim 1 for portions of video or audio in the multimedia information that satisfy selection criteria as recited.

Additionally, the Office Action alleges on page 3 that Yang discloses that clips of video information or audio are identified “as sound components” in Col. 1, lines 45-67. However, this section fails to provide convincing evidence of the conclusion proffered in the Office Action that any such identification process occurs or that an analysis occurs as recited in claim 1. The first paragraph of the cited section is reproduced below:

It is an object of the invention to provide improved management of multimedia objects by means of enhanced input, manipulation, and output thereof.

There is no suggestion in the improved management of multimedia objects of Yang that multimedia information is actually analyzed to identify portions of video information or audio information in the multimedia information that satisfy a selection criterion as recited in claim 1. The second paragraph of the cited section is reproduced below:

Thus, in one aspect, the invention organizes multimedia objects into plural collections, with each collection having one or more multimedia albums. Each album can contain plural multimedia objects, with each object including multimedia components such as text components, image components, sound components, and video components. Information at each multimedia component is stored in a separate record, and each and every multimedia object within a collection has exactly the same fields. Improved management of multimedia objects is afforded by providing the ability for a user to define new albums within a pre-existing collection, or by defining new collections. When a new album is added to an existing collection, the field for records in the album is the same as the pre-existing field format for other albums in the collection. On the other hand, when a new collection is added, new fields can be defined and stored as a new table entry in the overall multimedia database.

Again, there is no suggestion in the improved management of multimedia objects of Yang that multimedia information is analyzed to identify portions of video information or audio information in the multimedia information that satisfy a selection criterion as recited in claim 1. Yang merely sets forth the structure of albums in that each album can contain a plural multimedia objects, with each object including multimedia components such as text components, image components, **sound components**, and video components. Yang fails to disclose anything is extract as a sound component as alleged much less that the multimedia objects are analyzed to identify portions of video information or audio information in the multimedia objects that satisfy a selection criterion as recited in claim 1.

In yet another example, claim 1 recites in part:

extracting the identified portions of video information or audio information in the multimedia information with the processor of the computer system including at least a first portion of video information or audio information extracted by the processor from a first multimedia document in the plurality of multimedia documents and a second portion of video information or audio information extracted by the processor from a second multimedia document in the plurality of multimedia documents;

The Office Action fails to support its conclusion that Yang discloses the above recited feature of claim 1. The Office Action alleges on page 3 that “[h]e discloses extracting the identified portions of video information as clips or audio information as sound components.”

However, there is no citation to support such a conclusion. If the Office Action is relying on Col. 1, lines 45-67 as discussed above, Applicants have clearly shown that merely being able to represent an album with “a plural multimedia objects, with each object including multimedia components such as text components, image components, sound components, and video components” cannot be understood the act of including a multimedia component involves extracting as recited in claim 1. Yang discloses that the entire multimedia object is used as a component of the album. Understandably, if the user wants to place only a portion of a video or sound clip on an album, the user can manually create such a clip. However, as discussed in prior responses, this manual process is substantially different from the process recited in amend claim 1 because the user does not receive information identifying selection criteria, identify portions of a plurality of multimedia documents that satisfy the selection criteria, and extract those portions from at least two multimedia documents as recited in claim 1.

Finally, claim 1 recites in part:

printing the portions of video information or audio information in the multimedia information that satisfy the selection criterion using an output device associated with the computer system, including the extracted first portion and the extracted second portion, on a paper medium to generate the paper document comprising a set of one or more printed pages

The Office Action attempts to alleged that simply because Yang can print albums, the above recited limitation is disclosed. However, again, the Office Action fails to support this conclusion. FIGS. 14-19 illustrate albums that can be printed. However, printing an album prints the entire multimedia object on the album rather than only those portions of video information or audio information in the multimedia information that satisfy the selection criterion, including the extracted first portion and the extracted second portion as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Yang fails to disclose each and every claim limitation as recited in claim 1. Applicants further respectfully submit that none of the cited references cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Yang, and thus, claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 6, 13, 18, 23, and 26 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1, and

others which may be discussed further below. Applicants respectfully submit that the dependent claims that depend directly and/or indirectly from independent claims 1, 6, 13, 18, 23, and 26 respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

Claim 6

Claim 6 recites, in part, the following features:

accessing with the processor **printable representations** for the first multimedia document and the second multimedia document;

analyzing with the processor **the printable representation for the first multimedia document** in response to the input to identify at least one portion of the printable representation that satisfies the selection criterion;

analyzing with the processor **the printable representation for the second multimedia document** in response to the input to identify at least one portion of the printable representation that satisfies the selection criterion;

As recited, the printable representations of at least two multimedia documents are analyzed for generating a consolidated printable representation with desired portions of each. Clearly, claim 6 recites different limitations from claim 1 where the actual multimedia information stored in a plurality of multimedia documents is analyzed as recited. Yet, in rejecting claim 6, the Office Action copies the exact same wording as used to reject claim 1. The Office Action fails to differentiate and address how these two claims differ and how Yang allegedly analyzes the printable representations to identify portions that satisfy selection criteria as recited. Yang fails to disclose such limitations because as discussed above, Yang merely queries a database using predetermined criteria and fails to analyze printable representations of multimedia documents using the same predetermined criteria as recited in claim 6.

Claim 2

Claim 2 recites, in part, the features of:

printing text information on at least one page of the set of printed pages of the paper document using the output device **such that words in the text information that satisfy the selection criterion are annotated**, wherein **the text information is extracted** by the processor **from the portions of video information or audio information in the multimedia information**

The Office Action alleges that text in Yang that has been extracted from video or audio information is annotated when printed. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The “text annotation” referred to in Col. 22, lines 42-55 in Yang simply allows the user to apply text globally to all multimedia objects in an album. For example, Yang discloses that “the user may not want to type in the detailed description for each of the photos he/she took during the Paris vacation trip.” Yang discloses that in FIG. 29 “the user globally annotated the created photo album by Paris Trip.” Thus, this feature merely allows the user to “annotate” or tag multiple items within an album and have corresponding database fields populated with the same textual information. See FIG. 29 where each of the “detail description” fields have been populated with the phrase “Paris Trip.” FIGS. 22 and 23 merely illustrate that the use can have one or more database fields also placed on the album when viewed or printed. However, Yang does not disclose that these database fields include text information that has been extracted from portions of video information or audio information as recited, such as using OCR or audio transcription techniques. Moreover, “annotated” as recited in claim 2 is substantially different from the annotating or tagging in Yang.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter, Reg. No. 53,437/
Sean F. Parmenter
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 925-472-5000
Fax: 415-576-0300
SFP:lls
62173154 v1